



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/761,668	01/21/2004	James White	1332-001	3406

7590 04/12/2005

LAW OFFICES OF ADAM H. JACOBS
SUITE 726
1904 FARNAM STREET
OMAHA, NE 68102

EXAMINER

BLAU, STEPHEN LUTHER

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3711

DATE MAILED: 04/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/761,668

Applicant(s)

WHITE ET AL.

Examiner

Stephen L. Blau

Art Unit

3711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected under rule 1.71 Title 37 C.F.R. for not being written in a full, clear, concise and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the same. Specifically it is uncertain how the step of selecting a representative golf club is performed. Is it the favorite club (Page 15 lines 10-15)? Is it a 6-iron (Page 12, Lns. 15-22)? Or is it based completely on the measured hand strength converted using Chart 1-A (Page 5, Lns. 2-10)? It is uncertain how to determine the corresponding balance index and dead weight values for at least some of the other clubs in a set (Page 5, Lns. 18-23)? Is it that all the clubs in a set with have the same index value? It is uncertain how the charts are used (i.e. Chart 1-A, 1-B, 1-C, and CPM Chart #1 and #2)?

Claim Objections

2. Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 2 is missing a period at the end of the sentence. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. In claim 1 it is uncertain how the step of selecting a representative golf club is performed. Is it the favorite club? Is it a 6-iron provided by the fitter? Or is it based completely on the measured hand strength converted? If the club is provided by the fitter then how will this method benefit a golfer in that it appears for claims 1 and 11 that all clubs in a set will have an index of a club provided by a fitter? In claim 1 it is uncertain how to determine the corresponding balance index and dead weight values for at least some of the other clubs in a set? Is it that all the clubs in a set will have the same index value? It is uncertain what one skilled in the art would do when comparing the representative club with the current favorite club (Claim 4)? It is uncertain how one skilled in the art is to adjust the head weight and shaft length based on a player's swing characteristics (Claim 6)? It is uncertain how charts are used to select a set of golf clubs (Claim 7)? The specification does not show an example on how this is to be

done. If the 6-iron is the representative club than how will it be proportional to grip strength (Claim 11)? It is uncertain how to perform this method using a 7-iron (Claim 12)? There are no charts for a 7-iron.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In Claim 8 line 8 figures are referred to. A claim cannot refer to drawings or figures. It is uncertain what in the figures is a claim limited to.

Appropriate correction is required.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Heitman discloses how to measure grip strength. Edwards discloses how to determine swing weight. Bunn discloses how to fit a club to a golfer. None of the prior art disclose computing a Basic Index as claimed.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steve Blau whose telephone number is (571) 272-4406. The examiner is available Monday through Friday from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.. If the

Art Unit: 3711

examiner is unavailable you can contact his supervisor Greg Vidovich whose telephone number is (571) 272-4415. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858. (TC 3700 Official Fax 703-872-9306)

slb/ 10 April 2005



STEPHEN BLAU
PRIMARY EXAMINER